

I am hopeful that by working together we can come up with an economic strategy which provides fiscal security by using any surplus pay down our publicly held debt and make Social Security and Medicare solvent, while also providing a tax relief package that helps working families. The bill before us today doesn't do this and I cannot support it. I hope our actions today will bring the House leadership to the table to design a measure that the President can sign into law.

IN HONOR OF PARMADALE'S 75TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Parmadale's 75th anniversary. Over the years, this organization has continued to provide a vital caring service for deprived and needy children in the city of Parma. It has been an outstanding force in support of the family unit and provides an essential vision of social cohesion within our community for which we should all pay our respect.

Founded in September 1925, Parmadale was created with the objective of strengthening families by teaching parents how to more effectively care for their children. Throughout its years of community service, Parmadale's ethos has always been founded upon the strengths of family, neighborhood and community. As a care treatment provider it has maintained this fundamental value through services such as "Whole Family Treatment." It has also succeeded in adapting to the changing needs of children in our society.

Today it provides essential services for children suffering from drug dependence, mental difficulties, and serious emotional problems. The center prides itself on its flexible clinical response to the needs of children. The faculty provides specialized residential services, a range of foster care, as well as in-home services and day care. In 1989, the St. Augustine Center for Special Needs Children was established. This was the first Intensive Treatment Center for adolescents in the State of Ohio. In 1994, its success was conformed by the addition of a second Intensive Treatment Center.

My fellow colleagues please join me in paying respect to the outstanding work of the Parmadale Center. Its years of experience and flexible approach to care services ensure that it will continue to provide an invaluable service for the youth and general community of Parma, Ohio.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 5179, THE
REGISTERED NURSES AND PA-
TIENTS PROTECTION ACT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today, with our colleague, the Gentleman from Massachusetts

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

(Mr. MCGOVERN), I am introducing legislation that would restrict the ability of hospitals and other medical facilities to require registered nurses to work mandatory overtime hours as a normal course of business. Increasingly, employers, particularly in the health care field, are requiring employees to work overtime. Our legislation is H.R. 5179, the Registered Nurses and Patients Protection Act.

The Fair Labor Standards Act grants nurses the right to receive overtime compensation even though they are licensed professionals, but it does not limit the amount of overtime that nurses can work nor does it permit them to refuse mandatory overtime. In this era of full employment, it is simply easier and cheaper for hospital administrators to require existing employees to work overtime than it is for them to recruit and train new employees.

Mr. Speaker, no employer should be allowed to force an employee to work overtime or face termination unless there is an emergency situation that requires immediate emergency action. In the health care field, however, we are not just talking about an employee's right to refuse overtime work. We are also talking about patient safety. When nurses are forced to put in long overtime hours on a regular basis against their better judgment, it puts patients at risk.

The Registered Nurses and Patients Protection Act would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to prohibit mandatory overtime beyond 8 hours in a work day or 80 hours in any 14-day work period except in the case of a natural disaster or in the event of a declaration of an emergency by federal, state or local government officials. The legislation does not preclude a nurse from voluntarily working overtime.

Mr. Speaker, mandatory overtime for nurses is bad health care policy. A nurse shouldn't be on the job after the 15th or 16th consecutive hour especially after she has told her supervisor "I can't do this, I've been on the job too many hours today."

Nursing is physically and mentally demanding. When a nurse is tired, it is much more difficult to deliver quality, professional care to patients. Health care experts and common sense tell us that long hours take a toll on mental alertness and mandatory overtime under such conditions can result in serious medical mistakes—medication errors, transcription errors, and errors in judgment. By the end of a regular shift a nurse is exhausted. Increasingly, however, nurses are being forced to work 16, 18 or even 20 consecutive hours in hospitals across our nation.

Mr. Speaker, a nurse knows better than anyone—better than her supervisor and better than a hospital administrator—when she has reached the point of fatigue when continuing to work can result in serious medical problems. We must give nurses more power to decide if long hours on the job is making it difficult to perform their duties. This legislation is not a case of government micro-managing—this legislation gives nurses the power to say "NO" to the forced overtime practices of hospitals nationwide. We cannot continue to allow hospitals to force nurses to work so many hours that the health and safety of patients are put at risk. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the adoption of the Registered Nurses and Patients Protection Act.

September 14, 2000

FSC REPEAL AND EXTRA-TERRI-
TORIAL INCOME EXCLUSION ACT
OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 2000

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is problematic for a number of reasons. First, it does not address concerns laid out clearly in a letter to Deputy Secretary Eizenstat I signed in April along with 31 of my colleagues. I am attaching a copy of that letter.

In the wake of the WTO's adverse decision on Foreign Sales Corporations, we urged the Administration—as it fashioned its response to the WTO decision—to resist efforts to increase benefits for military arms sales. After all, if the U.S. is serious about leading the world into a peaceful future, we should be promoting arms control—not increasing subsidies for defense contractors so that they can promote the conventional arms race. But this bill does just what we urged the Administration not to do—it would increase defense contractor subsidies.

In addition, this bill continues export subsidies for tobacco, thus making it American policy to promote the sales of cigarettes all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, these are serious issues deserving of serious debate. At a minimum, the bill should have been brought up under a rule for purposes of a thorough debate and consideration of amendments. This was especially necessary given the cost of the bill. At \$1.5 billion over five years (in addition to the revenue that would be lost under FSC), this bill should have been more thoroughly discussed before being put to a vote.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support H.R. 4986 as it has been brought before the House.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, April 19, 2000.

Hon. STUART E. EIZENSTAT,
Deputy Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY EIZENSTAT: In your position as the lead Administration official charged with implementing an acceptable response to the adverse World Trade Organization (WTO) decision on Foreign Sales Corporations (FSC), we urge you to resist all efforts to increase benefits for military arms sales. Indeed, the existing benefits should actually be narrowed.

The current limitation on this benefit, as contained in 26 USC §923(a)(5), provides that the normal FSC benefit is reduced by 50% for sales of certain military property, defined by Treasury as, "an arm, ammunition, or implement of war." Specific covered military property is listed on the U.S. Munitions List (22 CFR 121), as provided for by the Arms Export Control Act (22 USC §2778).

Firmly believing that our nation should be providing more leadership for effective arms control policies, we seek your help to avoid additional subsidies with federal taxpayer monies to promote the conventional arms races that plague our planet. We should be promoting arms control, not arms sales.

The complicated legislative history of the FSC provision does show that it was intended to help U.S. companies to compete

overseas. However, according to the Congressional Research Service, in 1997, the United States enjoyed a 44% share of the world market for arms while Great Britain, its nearest competitor, had 17%. In 1998, the United States led in new arms deals with \$7.1 billion, followed by Germany at \$5.5 billion. Even the Defense Department has touted the world market dominance by U.S. companies, writing in 1994:

"The forecasts support a continuing strong defense trade performance for U.S. defense products through the end of the decade and beyond. In a large number of cases, the U.S. is clearly the preferred provider, and there is little meaningful competition with suppliers from other countries. An increase in the level of support the U.S. government currently supplies is unlikely to shift the U.S. export market share outside a range of 53 to 59 percent of worldwide arms trade."

In 1976, Congress decided to reduce the benefit for military sales in half, establishing a 50% limit on tax benefits. In fact, the Senate provision would have eliminated it altogether for military goods, "unless it was determined that the property is competitive with foreign-manufactured property," and the House provision would have terminated benefits for military sales, "except if the products are to be used solely for non-military purposes." A report from the Joint Committee on Taxation at the time shows that Congress was very concerned with the revenue cost of this program. To increase this benefit now would cost federal taxpayers an additional \$2 billion over the next 10 years. This subsidy is unnecessary. As Treasury's Office of Tax Policy wrote to the Department of Defense in December, 1998:

"[W]e analyzed whether the defense industry receives any benefits or subsidies from the U.S. government, particularly any benefits or subsidies that are not generally available to other industries. Our analysis indicates that the defense industry does benefit from its special relationship with the U.S. government, and the benefit is arguably greater now than in years past . . ."

On the question of doubling the FSC benefit to 100% for military sales, Treasury wrote in August, 1999:

"We have seen no evidence that granting full FSC benefits would significantly affect the level of defense exports, and, indeed, we are given to understand that other factors, such as the quality of the product and the quality and level of support services, tend to dominate a buyer's decision whether to buy a U.S. defense product."

In criticizing some of the continued largesse the defense industry enjoys in our federal budget, the Congressional Budget Office wrote in 1997:

"U.S. defense industries have significant advantages over their foreign competitors and thus should not need additional subsidies to attract sales. Because the U.S. defense procurement budget is nearly twice that of all Western European countries combined, U.S. industries can realize economies of scale not available to their competitors. The U.S. defense research and development budget is five times that of all Western European countries combined, which ensures that U.S. weapon systems are and will remain technologically superior to those of other suppliers."

More recently, William D. Hartung, President's Fellow at the World Policy Institute, wrote for the Cato Institute in August, 1999, "If the government wanted to level the playing field between the weapons industry and other sectors, it would have to reduce weap-

ons subsidies, not increase them." He continued, "Considering those massive subsidies to weapons manufacturers, granting additional tax breaks to an industry that is being so pampered by the U.S. government makes no sense."

Indeed, Mr. Secretary, it makes no sense. But what is much more persuasive than the fiscal fairness arguments, is the eloquent plea from advocates for peace, such as Oscar Arias, the former Costa Rican president and Nobel Peace Prize winner in 1987, who wrote last summer in the New York Times:

"By selling advanced weaponry throughout the world, wealthy military contractors not only weaken national security and squeeze taxpayers at home but also strengthen dictators and human misery abroad."

By encouraging arms sales overseas, this subsidy actually elevates the dangers abroad, thus creating more challenges to the maintenance of our own "military superiority"—and of course more pressure to increase the defense budget. We urge you not to increase this unnecessary subsidy and to seek ways to reduce the cost to taxpayers of subsidizing weapons manufacturers.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Doggett, Lynn Woolsey, George Miller, Pete DeFazio, Bob Filner, Barbara Lee, Barney Frank, Jan Schakowsky, John Tierney, Tammy Baldwin, Dennis Kucinich, Cynthia McKinney, Jerrold Nadler, John Olver, Bill Luther, Major Owens, Lynn Rivers, Jesse Jackson, Jr., Tom Barrett, Edward Markey, Bernard Sanders, John Moakley, Jim McGovern, Michael Capuano, Sherrod Brown, John Conyers, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Ted Strickland, Pete Stark, Mark Udall, David Minge, Brian Baird.

HONORING THE MEN OF C COMPANY, 1ST BATTALION 5TH MARINE REGIMENT, 1ST MARINE DIVISION

HON. DEBBIE STABENOW

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the men of C Company, 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division for the combat action they valiantly fought on April 5, 1947, near the village of HsinHo in North China.

Mr. Speaker, not many Americans remember that we sent the Marines into China in the aftermath of World War II to disarm the Japanese forces there, protect them from reprisals, relieve them from their garrisons and to ensure that the large quantity of Japanese weapons cached there did not fall into communist hands. C Company was literally on the front line of this effort. The Company was attacked during the early morning of April 5th by a group of Chairman Mao's fighters who were intent on capturing the weapons cached at HsinHo and overrunning the Marines there.

With a force estimated at over 300 men, the communists hit upon a lightly guarded outpost with a defense system designed to fight off an attack until reinforcements arrived. Under heavy fire, these Marines pursued this group of communist raiders for over eight miles. As the Commandant of the Marine Corps de-

clared in 1998, the actions of C Company, 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment were indeed "gallant deeds of brave Marines . . . and a shining example of honor and commitment."

When the dust had settled on that little hamlet in north China, America had lost five Marines killed in action and suffered 18 wounded. Mr. Chairman, a grateful nation will remember our Marines in World War II. We need to remember and honor those who fought and died for this country. The survivors of C Company have for years attempted to get official recognition for their Company in addition to the China Service Medal, Purple Hearts and Bronze and Silver Star medals awarded individually to members of C Company. I think this recognition is long overdue. I rise today to declare that the C-1-5 China Marines are to be commended as a unit for their actions of April 5th, 1947.

WELCOME PRIME MINISTER ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to welcome today the Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, in recognition of both his leadership in the pursuit of democracy as well as his commitment to strengthening relations between the United States and India. In his visit to the United States, Prime Minister Vajpayee demonstrates his people's interest in not only strengthening, but expanding the ties between our nations.

The United States and India share common goals for the 21st Century: freedom and democracy. By working together towards these mutual goals, the U.S. and India can build strong foundations for peace and prosperity. With peace as a common interest, it is our responsibility to ensure international security and regional stability. Prime Minister Vajpayee represents a friendship that can further these goals through cooperative programs and shared visions.

Together, the United States and India represent one-fifth of the world's population and more than one-fourth of the world's economy. Therefore, the growing bond between our nations is a positive step for everyone. In particular, California's 17th District has a significant Indian population which could greatly benefit from improved relations between India and the U.S.

I commend Prime Minister Vajpayee for being the first Indian Prime Minister in six years to address a joint session of Congress and the only world leader to address the 106th Congress. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Prime Minister Vajpayee.